UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,696	02/18/2004	Erwin Simnacher	69643.001500 9538	
	7590 02/24/201 /ILLIAMS LLP	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTU. 1900 K STREE	AL PROPERTY DEPA	MEHTA, PARIKHA SOLANKI		
SUITE 1200	,1,1N. W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006-1109	3737		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/24/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No		Applicant(s)			
		10/779,696		SIMNACHER, ERWIN			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		PARIKHA S. MI	EHTA	3737			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cove	er sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress		
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RECHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sleply received by the Office later than three months after the next patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS C R 1.136(a). In no event, how n. eriod will apply and will expire tatute, cause the application	OMMUNICATION vever, may a reply be time SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this of (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•		
Status							
2a)⊠	<i>'</i> —	This action is non-fir		socution as to the	o morite is		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
	closed in accordance with the practice und	iei Ex parte Quayle,	1933 C.D. 11, 43	3 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims						
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-8, 10-14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 							
Applicati	on Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exanthe drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the column to the oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) ob the drawing(s) be held rrection is required if the	d in abeyance. See ne drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 C	, ,		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notic	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) [_) 5) [Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal P	te			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:							

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9 December 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eizenhoefer (US Patent No. 5,119,801), hereinafter Eizenhoefer ('801), of record, in view of Hagood (US Patent No. 5,869,189), hereinafter Hagood ('189), of record.

Eizenhoefer ('801) teaches a medical shock wave apparatus comprising piezoelectric fibers integrated in a material in a lengthwise direction between respective electrical terminals, a voltage source connected to at least one terminal, a coupling membrane defining a volume filled with a shock wave transmission fluid between the fibers and the membrane, a curved planar carrier having a conductive portion coupled to multiple modules of fiber, the modules including fibers with a common electrical contact, wherein the modules are controllable as a module group (Fig. 1, col. 2 line 62 – col. 3 line 55). Eizenhoefer ('801) teaches the material to be continuous (col. 3 lines 59-60), and additionally teaches the fibers as pointing toward the coupling membrane (col. 3 lines 15-27). Eizenhoefer ('801) does not expressly teach the material to be composite. In the same field of endeavor, Hagood ('189) teaches a medical ultrasonic transducer wherein multiple piezoelectric fibers are integrated in a composite material (col. 2 lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have substituted the composite material of Hagood ('189) for the material of Eizenhoefer ('801), as a

skilled artisan would expect the apparatus of Eizenhoefer ('801) to work equally well with a composite material, and such modification would require nothing more than the mere combination of known prior art elements to yield predictable results, which has previously been held as obvious and unpatentable (KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385).

Page 3

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 9 December 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Eizenhoefer ('801) and Hagood ('189) fail to teach a "continuous composite material". Examiner respectfully directs Applicant's attention to col. 3 lines 59-60 of Eizenhoefer ('801), wherein the reference clearly describes the material as being "gapfree", which is interpreted to constitute "continuous" as claimed.

As Applicant's arguments are wholly unpersuasive for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 10-14 remain rejected as unpatentable over the prior art of record as reiterated herein.

Conclusion

5. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/779,696 Page 4

Art Unit: 3737

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PARIKHA S. MEHTA whose telephone number is (571)272-3248. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Casler can be reached on 571.272.4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRIAN CASLER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737

/Parikha S Mehta/ Examiner, Art Unit 3737